

**Ramona Community Planning Group
15873 Hwy 67 – Ramona, CA 92065
Minutes for a Special Meeting June 19, 2008
Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane
7:00 – 9:30 P.M.**

A special meeting of the Ramona Community Planning Group was held on June 19, 2008 at 7 p.m., at the Ramona Community Center, 434 Aqua Lane, Ramona, California.

In Attendance:	Chad Anderson	Chris Anderson (Arr. 8:20)	Torry Brean
	Carolyn Dorroh	Katherine L. Finley	Kathy S. Finley (Arr. 8:05)
	Dennis Grimes	Kristi Mansolf	Vivian Osborn
	Helene Radzik	Dennis Sprong	Luauna Stines
	Angus Tobiason		

Excused Absence: Matt Deskovick, Andrew Simmons

Helene Radzik, Chair of the RCPG, acted as Chair of the meeting. Kristi Mansolf, Secretary of the RCPG, acted as Secretary of the meeting.

ITEM 1: The Chair Called the Meeting to Order at 7:08 p.m.

ITEM 2: Pledge of Allegiance

ITEM 3: The Secretary Determined a Quorum was Present

ITEM 4 LIST OF ABSENTEES FOR THIS MEETING. Determination of Excused and Unexcused Absences by the RCPG – Secretary Will Read Record Separately from the Minutes – Matt Deskovick and Andrew Simmons had excused absences.

ITEM 5: NON-AGENDA ITEMS (No Presentation on Ongoing Projects – These Must be Agendized) Presentation from Public on Land Issues not on Current Agenda – None.

ITEM 6: ANNOUNCEMENTS & Correspondence Received (Chair)

The Chair announced that there would be an ice cream social to celebrate the completion of the "Welcome to Ramona Monument" on Friday, June 27 from 5:30 to 7:00 p.m., at the Monument – on the corner of Highland Valley Rd. and Hwy 67.

Ms. Mansolf announced that the County would not be attending the meeting.

ITEM 7: GP UPDATE PLAN (formerly 2020 Community Plan) (Action Items)
A. Consideration and Recommendation on Draft Village Limit Line

Speaker: Doug Wilsman, Ramona Resident

Mr. Wilsman introduced Ralph McIntosh, the incoming RMWD General Manager. On the Draft Village Limit Line map, the area shown in purple is the area in which the RMWD has LAFCO authority to provide services. There has been a study done to upgrade the Santa Maria Treatment facility. RMWD purchased land from the Nature Conservancy that the RMWD will be able to put spray fields on. The RMWD needs to be able to provide 3,000 more sewer connections. With the land purchased, they can provide 1,500 connections. Mr. Wilsman wants the County to know the RMWD can't serve, with sewer, the density proposed for Ramona.

Next Tuesday, the topic of Montecito Ranch will be briefly discussed at the RMWD meeting, and then again for 2 more meetings, as will the limitations of the RMWD to provide new sewer connections. Possibly it will come down to first come, first serve.

Water issues have not been forthcoming in anything Mr. Wilsman has reviewed from the County on Montecito Ranch. There is a lot of language on how to address water-related issues, but no information on what needs to be addressed. Two options for sewer are proposed. Mr. Wilsman said the RCPG may consider supporting the package treatment plant option under the present circumstances.

Ms. Mansolf presented the information the County had provided regarding the Draft Village Limit Line. Ramona is a "Village" in the eyes of the County. As concerns the Draft Village Limit Line, Ms. Mansolf has an old map of the Town Center. She will bring it to the next meeting so the RCPG can compare it with the proposed Draft Village Limit Line for density, boundaries, etc. If possible she will send it out electronically before the meeting July 3, 2008.

B. Draft Land Use Element - Comments for DPLU

All References to the Draft Land Use Element are for the Clean Copy.

Ms. Dorroh:

Page LU-17, LU 1.D, Goals and Policies. "A land use plan coordinated with the plans and activities of other agencies that relate to issues such as land use, safety, community character, transportation, ~~and~~ energy and infrastructure in the unincorporated County and the natural resources of the region."

George Boggs, from GP Update Subcommittee meeting:

Page LU-4, Regional Categories.

Village: 1st paragraph, 4th sentence. "Ideally, a village would reflect a ~~smart~~ growth development pattern, which is characterized as compact, higher density development that is within walking distance of commercial services, employment centers, civic uses, and/or transit."

Page LU-5, Regional Categories.

Village: Last paragraph, 3rd sentence. "Transit Nodes may be planned as diverse, mixed-use areas with a range of residential, ~~retail~~ commercial, and where appropriate, employment-generating land uses (e.g. office/professional or light industrial) as well as parks and civic spaces."

Page LU-6, Land Use Designations.

3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence. "Residential density is expressed as a maximum number of dwelling units per ~~gross~~ net acre (exclusive ~~or of~~ roads and rights-of-way)."

Page LU-6, Residential Land Use Designations.

2nd paragraph, last sentence. "Ground water dependent areas may be exempted to allow for Agricultural Housing as would be otherwise allowable."

Page LU-7, Table LU-1.

- Eliminate *Rural Lands 160*. This is tantamount to the "taking" of private property which results in the devaluation of the land. This in turn is devastating economically to agricultural operations which rely on land values as the underlying basis for financing. It is also contrary to goal LU-2C.
- Medium and High Density industrial should not be "by right" in Semi-Rural/Rural categories. Where necessary, it should be allowed by a Major Use Permit.

Page LU-8, Village Residential Designator

"Densities of 10.9 du/ac and higher shall comply with Community Character and Community Plan."

Page LU-8, Rural Lands Residential Designations

2nd sentence. "The densities provided by these designations are the lowest in the unincorporated County – ranging from 1 dwelling unit per 20 acres, to 2 dwelling unit per ~~460~~ 80 acres – and are intended to reflect and preserve the rural agricultural, environmentally constrained..." (to correspond with suggested change in Table LU-1).

Page LU-9, Non-Residential Land Use Designations

1st paragraph, last sentence. This section with all of its subcategories (page LU-9 through LU-12) will codify the long standing practice to ignore Community Character and Community Plan. "In any case, the permitted development intensity should be 'supportive' of the goals and policies of the General Plan and the applicable Community Plan." renders said plan totally impotent. In the various subcategories, Community Character is ignored, and long standing Ramona problems such as "outside sales/storage, C-36 zoning, etc., in Ramona's commercial center are perpetuated. Passive and vague verbiage

of this section should at the very least include the caveat, ... shall comply with Community Character and Community Plan.

Page LU-14, Community Plans

Last paragraph, 3rd sentence. "The additional planning may be conducted by private developers, the County, the Planning Group, or other appropriate entities, but with strong emphasis as a multi-lateral task effort."

Page LU-20, Goal LU-2.15

Delete entire goal. This is in direct conflict with LU-2.14 and precipitates "leap-frogging" which is prohibited by LU-1.3.

Page LU-23, Goal LU-3.1

While remaining compliant with the Community Plan, provide flexibility in regulations, such as reduced buffers, reduced encroachment restrictions, or special use allowances, for Village projects to integrate features such as unique topography or streambeds when appropriate to enhance community character."

Dennis Grimes:

Mr. Grimes said he did not feel the document was directive. It should have "shalls." The document is mealy-mouth. More directive language should be added. Right now it is too open to interpretation. Comment: The Land Use Element language must be directive so it can be applied consistently without the need for interpretation.

Torry Brean:

Page LU-9, Land Use Designations. General Commercial

Strike the 4th sentence. "~~Residential development may also be allowed as a secondary use in certain instances.~~" Works against definition of General Commercial.

Page LU-9, Land Use Designations. General Commercial.

Re: community parking lots – Shared parking arrangements may be allowed.

Page LU-10, Land Use Designations. Office Professional.

Strike the 2nd sentence. "~~Residential development may also be allowed as a secondary use in certain instances.~~" Residential development has used up Office Professional designated land in Ramona

(Kathy S. Finley arrived at 8:05)

Page LU-19, LU-2.6, Planning for Sustainability. Goals and Policies.

"Conservation oriented project design should not be less than 50 percent of the original lot size due to impacts to community character."

Carolyn Dorroh:

Page LU-19, LU-2.6

"If lots were originally for animal keeping, lot size reductions should not preclude large animal keeping."

Paul Tarr:

Mr. Tarr said the document needs a clear statement of intent. "The general plan shall adhere to the intent of the community plans."

Dennis Grimes:

Page LU-23, add under LU-4.5, Semi-Rural/Rural Lands. Goals and Policies

"Increased density and residential development shall not be allowed to encroach on agricultural use of agricultural lands."

Paul Tarr:

Mr. Tarr said that in the interest in preserving the ag element, clustering and small growth concepts are inappropriate in agricultural areas.

Kristi Mansolf:

Page LU-15, add to Infrastructure.

"Communities with unique infrastructure characteristics/limitations (example: Ramona spray fields) shall be given consideration of their constraints when planning development."

Page LU-21, add to 3rd paragraph on page, Villages and Town Centers.

"Adequate public transportation is necessary to support planned development in rural/village communities."

Page LU-19, Policy LU-2.11, Planning for Sustainability.

"Require protection of historic structures, sites, and districts, and resources contained in historic inventories or other documents reflecting information specific to historic points of interest, landmarks, and places that contribute to Community Character, and allow adaptive re-use of such resources when appropriate."

Chris Anderson:

Page LU-15, Infrastructure.

"Package treatment plants should be considered but not allowed to induce leap frog development."

MOTION: TO SEND COMMENTS ON DRAFT LAND USE ELEMENT.

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the Motion **passed 11-2-0-0-2**, with Chris Anderson and Luauna Stines voting no, and Matt Deskovick and Andrew Simmons absent.

- ITEM 8: OLD BUSINESS – Agenda of June 5, 2008. The Remainder of the Agenda of June 5, 2008 Will Be Carried Over to July 3, 2008 (Discussion and Possible Action)**
- A. The RCPG Previously Approved Sending a Letter to the County, SDCE and to SDG&E Regarding Obstructions in the Road Right of Way. Consideration of Specific Letter – Road Right-of-Way Safety Issues (From Transportation/Trails Subcommittee)**

MOTION: TO MOVE TO JULY 3, 2008, MEETING.

Upon motion made by Torry Brean and seconded by Kristi Mansolf, the Motion passed **13-0-0-0-2**, with Matt Deskovick and Andrew Simmons absent.

- B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES 5-1-08 and 4-17-08 (Action)**

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING APRIL 17, 2008, AND MAY 1, 2008.

Approved with no objections, with Chris Anderson, Kathy L. Finley, and Kathy S. Finley abstaining, and Matt Deskovick and Andrew Simmons absent.

- ITEM 9: OTHER OLD BUSINESS**
- A. Cumming Ranch, SP 03-005, GPA 03-0007, TM 5344RPL3, Highland Valley Rd. between Hwy 67 and El Sol Rd. 682.02 Acres. 805 Properties, Owner – Consideration Only To Send Comments from Meeting June 5, 2008. No Additional Speakers Will Be Heard.**

MOTION: TO SEND COMMENTS FROM JUNE 5, 2008, MEETING.

Upon motion made by Kristi Mansolf and seconded by Kathy S. Finley, the Motion passed **8-0-3-2-2**, with Chad Anderson, Chris Anderson, and Dennis Grimes abstaining, Vivian Osborn and Angus Tobiason stepping down, and Matt Deskovick and Andrew Simmons absent.

ITEM 10: ADJOURNMENT – 9:15

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Mansolf